

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_118475
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlates of Ghanaian Teachers' Understanding of Mathematics Strands and Cognitive Domains in Basic Education Certificate Examination
Type of the Article	Mathematical and statistical

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjom.com/index.php/ARJOM/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, this manuscript analyze the predictors of teachers, curriculum for mathematics, focusing on their ability to identify Blooms taxonomy domains. It also provide valuable insights for policy makers, educators, and curriculum designers to improve teacher quality and enhance mathematics education in Ghana.</p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes it is appropriate.</b></p> <p>5. <b>It is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p>6. <b>References' used are correct and sufficient.</b></p> <p><b>Apart of above all the discussions and conclusion points are satisfactory.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, Simple and under stable English is being used in manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>NIL</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bhawna Agrawal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rabindranath Tagore University, India</b>